

MINUTES
AVIATION TASK FORCE
February 20, 2003

(corrections noted and minutes approved 4/17/03)

List of Attending Members

Albanese-O'Neill, Anastasia	Southwest Airlines
Barrie, Terry	California Department of Transportation, Division of Aeronautics
Biane, Paul	County of San Bernardino
Bliss, Herman	Federal Aviation Administration (proxy: Richard Dykas, FAA)
Burkhart, Dan	National Business Aviation Association
Cox, Richard	Air Transport Association
Dixon, Richard,	Mayor, City of Lake Forest
Dunlap, Judy	Councilmember, City of Inglewood
Freeman, Greg	Los Angeles Area Economic Development Commission
Galanter, Ruth	Councilmember, City of Los Angeles
Gordon, Mike,	Mayor, City of El Segundo
Griffith, Barry	Palm Springs International Airport
Hammer, Russell	Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce
Knabe, Don	Supervisor, County of Los Angeles
Kunze, Chris	Long Beach Airport
Mikels, Judy,	Supervisor, County of Ventura (Chair)
Murphy, Alan,	Director, John Wayne Airport
O'Connor, Pam,	Councilmember, City of Santa Monica
Proo, Beatrice,	Mayor, City of Pico Rivera
Propst, Rod,	Chair, Aviation Technical Advisory Committee
Ritchie, Jim,	Deputy Executive Director, Los Angeles World Airports
Roberts, Ron	Mayor, City of Temecula
Rodine, Robert,	Valley Industry Commerce Association
Russell, Jon	Airline Pilots Association
Smith, Charles	Supervisor, County of Orange (proxy, Tom Wilson, County of Orange)
Smith, Scott,	Ventura County Department of Airports
Soderquist, Peter,	Airport Manager, Southern California Logistics Airport
Stanford, Dick,	Councilmember, City of Azusa
Stein, Ted	Los Angeles City Airport Commission (vice chair)
Thomas, Sheryl	Los Angeles World Airports, Government Affairs
Zettel, Charlene	San Diego County Airport Authority

MINUTES
AVIATION TASK FORCE
February 20, 2003

List of Absent Members

Adams, Frank	Federal Express
Antonovich, Mike	Supervisor, County of Los Angeles
Bagley, Jim	City of 29 Palms
Bates, Ron,	Councilmember, City of Los Alamitos
Bernson, Hal,	Councilmember, City of Los Angeles
Bishop, Richard	Western Riverside Council of Governments
Butler, Viggo	United Airports Limited
Davis, Bill	Ventura County Transportation Commission
De La Loza, James	Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
De Young, Cathryn,	Councilmember, City of Laguna Niguel
Dispenza, Mike	Councilmember, City of Palmdale
Fox, Guy	Los Angeles Air Cargo Association
Lloyd, Stephen	Federal Aviation Administration, Air Traffic Division
MacRae, Bruce	United Parcel Service
Miscikow ski, Cindy,	Councilmember, City of Los Angeles
Murphy, Stacey,	Councilmember, City of Burbank
Nestande, Bruce,	Los Angeles Business Advisors
Ovitt, Gary,	Mayor, City of Ontario
Perry, Bev	City of Brea
Ridgew ay, Tod	Mayor, City of New port Beach
Rizzo, Philip,	Executive Director, March Inland Port
Schatz, Carol	Central City Association
Streator, Joyce	Burbank Glendale Pasadena Airport Authority

MINUTES
AVIATION TASK FORCE
February 20, 2003

1.0 CALL TO ORDER

The February 20, 2003 meeting of the Aviation Task Force was called to order at 10:00 a.m. by Chairperson Judy Mikels, Supervisor, Ventura County.

2.0 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

Public Speakers

Patricia Hamilton	City of Los Angeles
Tom Naughton	City of New port Beach

Ms. Patricia Hamilton, City of Los Angeles, provided to task force members a Los Angeles Times article "*Scrambling to Handle More Desert Traffic*" and a visual comparison of airport property in the United States and Los Angeles County.

Ms. Hamilton stated that Mr. Ritchie, of Los Angeles World Airports, informed the Aviation Task Force at the January 2003 meeting that the LAX Master Plan is still in progress after nine years. Ms. Hamilton does not consider the plan to be as yet complete or comprehensive for a regional airport solution. Ms. Hamilton questioned investing \$10 billion in the smallest of airports in the Los Angeles metropolitan area?

Ms. Hamilton questioned the logic of the latest master plan in light of terrorist actions. In particular, Ms Hamilton questioned what makes planners think that any terrorist group would not include the ground transportation center into their plan. What makes the planners think that terrorists could not include the proposed Ground Transportation Center in their plans? Noting that there were two towers destroyed in New York, Ms. Hamilton stated that the LAX plan would only enlarge the target area allowing the terrorists to kill more people and destroy more buildings.

Ms. Hamilton noted that in January, Mr. Jim Ritchie of Los Angeles World Airports was asked if ground access projects would be completed before the runway improvements. Mr. Ritchie responded that they had not completed that phase. Mrs. Hamilton asked how could a Master Plan be complete if after nine years one of the major elements has not been addressed? Until a comprehensive and integrated regional ground access plan is in place, Ms. Hamilton noted, no airport Master Plan should be approved. Ms Hamilton asked the task force to think about the costs involved, both fiscal and in time, in a remote check-in followed by a people-mover trip to the airport.

Ms. Hamilton stated that LAWA has three major airports: LAX, Palmdale and Ontario; and asked if the \$10 billion could be used for improvements and ground

MINUTES
AVIATION TASK FORCE
February 20, 2003

transportation to the other airports? Ms. Hamilton stated that it was time to connect and grow airports regionally and that money should be used for Fly-Away's rather than People-Movers. Ms. Hamilton concluded that the county is in need of three major airports, not just one, which would help the economics of the entire Southern California Region.

Mr. Tom Naughton, City of Newport Beach, is the President of the Orange County Airport Working Group and an Orange County Airport Land Use Commissioner. A couple of years ago Mr. Naughton had the pleasure of visiting a number of airports in the Asia. Mr. Naughton recommended the members of the Aviation Task Force visit some of the Asian airports to see what they accomplished in not only the planning stages, but also in implementation. Mr. Naughton concluded, while this region is considering spending \$9 billion at LAX and grinding up runway at El Toro, nothing is being done to help the economics of this region as we enter the 21st Century.

3.0 ROUTINE ITEMS

3.1 January 16, 2003 Meeting Minutes

Chair Mikels asked if there were any corrections or comments concerning the minutes of the last meeting. Mr. Bob Rodine, VICA, said that on Page 12, Mr. Ritchie is cited making a comment regarding opportunity costs. That statement was actually made by Mr. Nick Johnson.

Mr. Rusty Hammer said that he failed to sign in at the January meeting, but was in fact, present.

Chair Mikels said that with those two corrections the minutes are accepted and filed.

3.2 Members Phone List

Chair Mikels requested all participants to review the membership listing and notify SCAG staff of any discrepancies in contact information. Chair Mikels stressed that each member provide the most consistent address, telephone number, e-mail address or fax number in order to receive timely information.

4.0 INFORMATION ITEMS

4.1 San Diego County Regional Airport Authority

MINUTES
AVIATION TASK FORCE
February 20, 2003

Ms. Charlene Zettel, San Diego County Regional Airport Authority Boardmember, thanked the Aviation Task Force for the opportunity to present information on the San Diego International Airport Master Plan and also the future needs of San Diego County. As of January 2003 the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority took control of operations at Lindbergh Field. The airport handles 15 million annual passengers, or ¼ of LAX. Ms. Zettel introduced Ms. Angela Shafer-Payne and Mr. Ted Anasis, both from the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority.

Ms. Shafer-Payne stated that the new San Diego County Regional Airport Authority (SDCRAA) has the primary responsibility of planning at San Diego International Airport, but also study and plan for improvements to the entire San Diego County airport system.

The San Diego International Airport is an important economic driver in San Diego County. Since September 11, 2001 the airport has not had a significant change in operations, cargo, passengers, or small package shipping. There has also been almost no loss in the destinations served by the airport. San Diego International Airport is one of the smallest major commercial airports in the United States with only one runway and a total acreage of 614 acres. The airport has a number of physical and airspace constraints to contend with. The present infrastructure will not be able to accommodate the forecast number of passengers within the next 15 years. Roadways, gates and runways will experience unacceptable levels of service.

The SDCRAA is currently updating the long-range passenger and cargo forecasts. By 2030, passenger and cargo forecasts will be well above the current capacity at Lindbergh Field.

Ms. Shafer-Payne then introduced Mr. Ted Anasis, SDCRAA Airport Planner. Mr. Anasis said that since San Diego International Airport is small and constrained, short and long-term needs must be addressed in the planning process. A possible new airport development could take 10-15 years; short-term improvements at Lindbergh Field must be pursued to insure that there is not a lapse in service.

The short-term improvements deal with ground access and terminal improvements that will keep options open for further expansion. There are 10 passenger-loading gates and additional aircraft parking planned for the next ten years. Between 2010 and 2015 an additional 4 gates would be added and vehicle parking facilities will be expanded. Should the airport remain at its present site there is potential for a new runway, additional terminal development on the north and additional parking facilities to the south. There are variations to this scenario depending on what property the airport is able to acquire.

MINUTES
AVIATION TASK FORCE
February 20, 2003

The Air Transportation Action Program (ATAP) is part of the long-term strategy. The program is aimed at meeting the air transportation needs of the County. This includes identifying a site, and examining the processes and timing of the new site. Based on the Airport Economic Analysis and the Regional Prosperity Goals the ATAP can quantify its decisions in regional economic gains (or losses). The ATAP is also looking at replacing Lindbergh Field and also opportunities for having it function in conjunction with another, new, commercial airport.

MINUTES
AVIATION TASK FORCE
February 20, 2003

There are currently 21 scenarios that are being evaluated against four criteria. These criteria are:

1. Operational feasibility,
2. Ground access,
3. Environmental impacts,
4. Development issues (property acquisition, construction, etc.).

The ATAP is designed to inform politicians on choices for the mandated election in either 2004 or 2006. The outcome of the public vote will have profound implications on the region's economy, either positively or negatively.

Mr. Dan Burkhart, National Business Aviation Association, asked what the impact would be on general aviation real estate at San Diego International Airport? Mr. Anasis responded that the current Fixed Based Operator (FBO) would remain and in Scenario 3, there is a potential for a second FBO.

Mr. Bob Rodine, VICA, asked if SDCRAA has planning authority at the other area airports (Brown, Gillespie, etc.)? Mr. Anasis responded that other airports are owned and operated by the City and County of San Diego. The SDCRAA is working with the airport operators on some planning issues.

An Aviation Task Force member asked about the role of the Marine Core Recruit Depot (MCRD) property in the airport plans? Mr. Anasis said that the property is federal property that is not under the Airport's control. Miramar, Tijuana and the Twin Ports sites are all considered long-term potential site options.

Mr. Chris Kunze, Long Beach Airport, asked how many annual passengers could be accommodated with the short-term improvements? Mr. Anasis replied that with the single runway scenario could serve 18.7 MAP, and a second runway scenario could handle 24.4 MAP. Mr. Anasis continued to say that there are about 30,000 residents living in the 65 CNEL currently and the airport has a departure curfew. The 18.7 MAP scenario would not change the impact area because there are no runway improvements.

An Aviation Task Force member asked how San Diego plans to meet the demand of 30 MAP when the airport under ultimate build out can only accommodate 24 MAP? Mr. Anasis said that is precisely the problem; Lindbergh Field cannot accommodate all of the County's demand in 2030.

Chair Mikels asked what impact the airport plans will have on military airspace? Mr. Anasis said that the operation orientations stay about the same and there are no substantial military conflicts. Chair Mikels replied that it is important to remember that there is also a direct correlation between economic well being and military operations.

MINUTES
AVIATION TASK FORCE
February 20, 2003

4.2 Orange County Aviation Update

Mr. Alan Murphy thanked the Aviation Task Force for the invitation to speak about John Wayne Airport and their future plans.

John Wayne Airport is owned and operated by the County of Orange and is the 45th busiest airport in the United States (based on enplanements) and the 3rd busiest in Southern California, handling 7.9 MAP in 2002. The airport has 14 passenger loading gates and about 504 acres. There is a large mixture of commercial and general aviation. The airport is surrounded by Costa Mesa, Irvine and Newport Beach and is highly encroached on almost every side.

The airport operates with a mandatory curfew, limiting nighttime departures and arrivals from about 11pm to 7am (depending on the day of the week). General aviation is allowed to operate 24 hours a day with some exceptions. In 1985 there were negotiations between the County of Orange, the City of Newport Beach, the FAA and other interested parties; a landmark agreement was created that limited commercial operations. The agreement was set to expire in 2005. About two years ago the parties began to negotiate again and have reached an agreement that will last through 2015. The update allows for an increase of MAP to 10.8 and some additional operations and passenger loading bridges. There was concern over the legality of updating the Settlement Agreement. On December 31, 2002 the airport received word from the Chief Counsel at the FAA that the agreement was acceptable. The Settlement Agreement is now at the United States District Court and is awaiting approval.

The airport is looking at the infrastructure improvements over the next 15 years in association with the Settlement Agreement. The airport will be taking about two years to plan and design the infrastructure, before beginning construction. Major improvements will include additional passenger loading bridges (terminal improvements), additional parking spaces, and internal roadway improvements. There has already been an environmental review process completed, so there will only be minimal additional environmental work.

Mr. Bob Rodine, VICA, asked how many residents are currently impacted by the 65 CNEL? Mr. Murphy said that there is a small impact area and that the new improvements will have virtually no change on the size or population of the impact area.

Hon. Dick Stanford, City of Azusa, said that it appears that there is loud community opposition against John Wayne Airport, what can that be attributed to? Mr. Alan Murphy responded that he doesn't necessarily agree with that. John

MINUTES
AVIATION TASK FORCE
February 20, 2003

Wayne Airport must be able to balance serving the county's aviation needs and negative environmental impacts.

Mr. Chris Kunze, Long Beach Airport, asked how big the impact area is in terms of acreage and population? Mr. Alan Murphy said that it is under 100 acres and has a population of about 300.

Mr. Jon Russell, Airline Pilots Association, asked how the airport plans to mitigate the non-conforming noise operations? Will landing slots be affected? Mr. Alan Murphy replied that the departure movements are controlled by the FAA. The carriers have been good partners in insuring that they are within the acceptable limits. Possible disciplinary action includes fines, barring of a specific aircraft class, or a loss of a landing slot (this has never occurred).

Mr. Peter Soderquist, Southern California Logistics Airport, asked whether the airport has a noise budget? Mr. Alan Murphy responded that the airport is not on a noise budget (unlike Long Beach), but John Wayne has noise limitations on the average single event operations. Cargo flights are handled the same as commercial operations.

Mr. Dan Burkhart, National Business Aviation Association, asked if the nighttime curfew for commercial flights is scheduled or actual? Mr. Alan Murphy replied that the curfew is for actual operations. If there is a weather or air traffic control impact that will delay a flight each case is looked at on an individual basis. Flights may be redirected to Ontario or Los Angeles.

Chair Mikels introduced Hon. Thomas Wilson, the Chair of the Orange County Board of Supervisors. Mr. Wilson thanked the Aviation Task Force for having the John Wayne Airport presentation on the agenda. Mr. Wilson wanted to comment on Item 4.2, the Orange County Update. Mr. Wilson said that he was sensitive that the staff report used the word 'only' six times in the memo. He continued to say that looking through the rest of the agenda the other memos seemed to have more objectivity. Secondly, Mr. Wilson prepared a response to the letter from Mr. Alan Murphy to SCAG in response to questions about Orange County's aviation demand and supply. Mr. Wilson said that there are two sides to every story and some of the county aviation demand figures have previously been questioned. Mr. Wilson is interested in looking for ground access improvements that will bring passengers from their homes to their airport of choice.

Chair Mikels responded that she understands the sensitivities associated with Orange County's aviation situation. She went on to say that SCAG took an action to no longer study El Toro in any of its plans.

MINUTES
AVIATION TASK FORCE
February 20, 2003

4.3 County Aviation Demand Responses

Mr. Ryan Hall, SCAG staff, gave a presentation on the County Demand Letters that were mailed out in October of 2002. The letters asked two questions: 1. What is your county's aviation demand in 2030 for passengers and cargo? And 2. How does your county plan to meet that demand? These letters were mailed to each of the six SCAG counties (Dept. of Airports, Dept. of Regional Planning and the County Transportation Commission) and the commercial airport operators.

Most of the counties replied with one letter that was a combined effort by the County Transportation Commissions, the Dept. of Planning and the Dept. of Airports. Most of the counties do not collect passenger demand information for the county overall, though they implied that they do have an interest in the data. The counties do not have the personnel or fiscal resources to make those types of forecasts. There are also no existing county wide plans; the airports have individual Master Plans, but those documents only look at one airport and do not track demand overall by county.

Each county was supportive and replied in a timely manner. Most of the counties did mention that they use the SCAG generated forecast demand numbers and that is one reason that they do not do their own analysis.

Hon. Ruth Galanter, City of Los Angeles, commented that airports are important to the economy and that there is no reason why each county shouldn't collect their own data. She said that it would be helpful to compare SCAG data with the county numbers so that there is some type of checks and balances.

Hon. Richard Dixon, City of Lake Forest, said that in other SCAG forecasts (for example, housing) the numbers are generated in a 'bottom's up' process with the local jurisdictions first giving input. The aviation demand collection issue could be brought up before the Transportation and Communication Committee or the Regional Council.

Mr. Robert Rodine, VICA, said that he had requested that there be some attention to general aviation. There are constraints in general aviation that have not been addressed.

5.0 ACTION ITEMS

5.1 Ground Access Planning Teams

MINUTES
AVIATION TASK FORCE
February 20, 2003

Mr. Rich Macias, SCAG Aviation and Environmental Planning Manager, gave a presentation on the Ground Access Planning Teams. The Task Force approved the initial workplan in October of 2002. Part of the plan was to develop an Implementation Plan for the Aviation Component of the Regional Transportation Plan. In November 2002, the Task Force approved the formation of Ground Access Planning Teams to help plan for airport ground access support. Three additional cities need to be added to Team 1: Inglewood, El Segundo and Ontario.

Staff is proposing that the Aviation Task Force allow staff to examine and study the possibility of developing an Aviation Authority. With the demise of the Southern California Regional Airport Authority (SCRAA), there is still a pressing need for regional implementation. A new authority could plan and implement airport plans, as well as coordinate ground access. Without an implementation plan, there is only a forecast, with no means to get there.

Mr. Richard Dixon, City of Lake Forest, opposed the action on the following basis:

1. The creation of a regional airport authority eliminates the key element of regionalism, which is local authority.
2. The staff report indicates that the funding for this endeavor will come from the SCRAA. However, all language from the SCAG FAA grant regarding the SCRAA was removed, so no such funding exists. Congressman Cox will be investigating the spirit of the FAA grant and will be closely monitoring the Aviation Task Force should this item move forward.
3. The Aviation Task Force does not have the authority to make a motion to study or plan for an Airport Authority. That authority, if it exists, is in the hands of the Regional Council.

Mr. Ted Stein, Los Angeles City Airport Commission, said that he would like the item to be tabled until the next meeting. Hon. Hal Bernson, City of Los Angeles, has some very strong feelings on the issue, but unfortunately was not able to attend today.

Chair Mikels clarified that the Aviation Task Force absolutely does not have the authority to create a Regional Airport Authority and, if approved, would go through the Regional Council process. This is merely a recommendation for SCAG staff to study the possibility of an Airport Authority. This was President Bernson's project and in all fairness he should be here to present it.

Hon. Mike Gordon, City of El Segundo, commented that the Southern California Regional Airport Authority is not defunct yet, but is in a critical stage. However, there is a substantial amount of money that could be used to help fund the creation of a new implementing authority. There needs to be some type of implementation strategy and there needs to be greater discussion on the topic.

MINUTES
AVIATION TASK FORCE
February 20, 2003

Hon. Tom Wilson, County of Orange, felt misled by the title of the Item, "Ground Access Planning Teams". Mr. Wilson expressed concern over the term implementation and how it relates to the ground access planning teams. The teams appear to be going into a policy realm, rather than staying purely technical. Mr. Wilson was also concerned about the membership of the teams, and how they were developed. Mr. Wilson will be preparing a formal letter to Chair Mikels that will detail his concerns.

Mr. Terry Barrie, Caltrans Aeronautics, said that each team should also include a representative from Caltrans (specifically Districts 7,8, and 12). In addition, Caltrans completed an airport ground access study in August 2001 that can be provided to staff.

Chair Mikels asked for a motion to continue Item 5.1 to the next Aviation Task Force meeting. The motion was passed with no objection.

6.0 SET NEXT MEETING DATE/TIME/PLACE

Chair Mikels stated that the schedule calls for the third Thursday of every month. The next meeting will be held on March 20, 2003 at the SCAG offices at 10:00 a.m.

7.0 ADJOURNMENT

Chair Mikels adjourned the meeting at 12:02 pm.